



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,493	07/02/2003	Chuan-Pei Yu	B-5146 621065-3	4430
36716	7590	05/03/2005	EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY 5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2100 LOS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679			NEILS, PEGGY A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H.A

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/613,493

Applicant(s)

YU ET AL.

Examiner

Peggy A. Neils

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 5-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon et al.

Moon et al shows a backlight device, which includes supports 55 with each support having a u-shape which cooperates with another support to form a circular enclosure for the lamps 31. The lamp holders may be formed of plastic (see page 3, paragraph 34). As shown in Figure 4, the supports are shaped in a rectangular shape. A reflector is shown in Figure 6 at 591a. Plural diffusion plates may be placed above the supports (see page 3, paragraph 39 near the bottom). To permit expansion of the support would be a design consideration depending on the heat generated from the unit. Likewise whether the supports and reflector are glued together or integral as suggested by Moon et al would depend on how the device is made and does not affect the final operation of the backlight device.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nagano.

Nagano teaches that it is known in the art to provide a support for elongated lamps that includes a circular opening enclosing the lamp. Nagano states that receptacle arms 57

Art Unit: 2875

and 59 are resilient and are dimensioned to create a slight interference fit with lamp 61. The slight interference fit would accommodate heat expansion of the support. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that Moon et al could have been modified to include an interference fit in the support openings for the lamps in the same manner as taught by Nagano et al because both references are directed to supports for fluorescent lamps.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Altman et al.

Altman et al teaches that it is known in the art to have lighting device for fluorescent lamps, which include circular supports 20, which fit within a reflecting plate with cooperating edges 22 which fit within a groove 16. Moon et al only suggests that the supports could be integral with the reflector. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the supports of Moon et al could be secured to the reflector plate with a latching mechanism taught by Altman et al because both references are directed to similarly structured lighting devices.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon et al as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Adachi et al. Moon et al mentions diffusers being placed above the lamps. Adachi et al teaches that in addition to a diffuser a backlight device may include a prism. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that Moon et al could include a prism in addition to the diffuser because both references are directed to backlight units and prisms are commonly used to focus emitted light.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Farchmin et al is cited of interest.

Any questions regarding this Office action should be directed to Examiner Neils  
(571) 272-2377 on a Tuesday or Thursday.



**Y. MY QUACH-LEE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**